

Appln No. 09/886,538
Amdt date January 25, 2007
Reply to Office action of July 25, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 3-17 were pending in the application when last examined. Claims 11 and 17 are being canceled. Claims 3, 4, 12, and 15 are being amended. Claims 3-12 and 15-22 are now pending of which claims 3-10 and 12-16 are now pending of which claims 3 and 15 are independent.

Claims 3-12 and 15-17 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Celik (U.S. Patent No. 6,374,259), in view of Delany (U.S. Patent No. 6,658,454). Claims 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Celik in view of Delany and further in view of Fisher (U.S. Patent No. 6,047,264).

Claim 3 is now amended for form. Claim 3 is also amended to specify a method includes providing the contact information..."automatically in response to receiving updated contact information of the user". Thus, claim 3 has been amended to include portions of either of now cancelled prior dependent claim 11 or now cancelled prior dependent claim 17.

Regarding now cancelled prior dependent claim 11, the Office action mailed July 25, 2006, points to Celik at col. 1, lines 50-58, col. 2, lines 8-26, col. 4, lines 8-22, col. 4, line 64 to col. 5, line 15, col. 8, line 53 to col. 9, line 28, col. 10, lines 11-31, and Delany et al. at col. 4, line 22 through col. 5, line 45, for disclosing "wherein the server sends the e-mails to at least some of the contacts of the user on the distribution list automatically in response to receiving of data contact information regarding the user. Office action, p. 7. The Office action points to a subset of these citations for disclosing what is specified in claim 17.

None of the cited portions of Celik or Delany et al. disclose or suggest "providing the contact information regarding the user to at least some of the contacts of the user on the distribution list automatically in response to receiving updated contact information of the user"

Appln No. 09/886,538
Amdt date January 25, 2007
Reply to Office action of July 25, 2006

as specified by claim 3. Indeed, it does not appear that Celik or Delany, et al. disclose providing the contact information regarding the user to anyone automatically in response to receiving updated contact information of the user. Each of the portions of Celik and Delany et al. cited by the Office action in this regard are discussed below.

Celik at col. 1, lines 50-58 merely indicates that the invention of Celik enables a second user to access the remote database over a network using a second computer to retrieve information related to the first user. Celik, col. 1, lines 55-58. Enabling a second user to retrieve information does not disclose or suggest "providing the contact information regarding the user...automatically in response to receiving updated contact information of the user" as specified by claim 3.

Celik at col. 2, lines 8-26 is similar in that the text indicates that the invention of Celik features an application module containing instructions to enable a network user to access the remote database over the network using a second network computer to retrieve information in the remote database related to a first user. Celik, col. 2, lines 22-26. Thus, again Celik discusses retrieval of information by a second user, and does not disclose or suggest "providing the contact information regarding the user...automatically in response to receiving updated contact information of the user" as specified by claim 3.

Celik at col. 4, lines 8-22 appears to relate to storage of contact information for a user 1, and does not appear to discuss providing the contact information to other users at all.

Celik at col. 4, line 64 - col. 5, line 15 also appears directed to retrieval of information, in that a second personal computer may make a request to the remote computer for contact information. Celik, col. 4, lines 64-65. Thus, again Celik does not disclose or suggest "providing the contact information regarding the user...automatically in response to receiving updated contact information of the user" as specified by claim 3.

Appln No. 09/886,538
Amdt date January 25, 2007
Reply to Office action of July 25, 2006

Celik at col. 8, line 53 to col. 9, line 28 discusses that a user identification number of user 1 is input into the synchronizer of the second computer. Celik, col. 8, line 60-62. The synchronizer connects to the database through the remote computer to obtain contact information of user 1. Celik, col. 9, lines 15-18. Finally, assuming that a number of other conditions are met, contact information for the user corresponding to the identification number selected is downloaded to the second computer. Celik, col. 9, lines 62-64. Accordingly, again Celik appears to be discussing retrieval of information, and not "providing contact information regarding the user...automatically in response to receiving updated contact information of the user" as specified in claim 3.

Col. 10, lines 11-31 of Celik also appear directed to retrieval of information. For example, a synchronizer is configured to automatically contact the remote computer and database on a periodic basis to update information in the PIM. Celik, col. 10, lines 25-28.

Delany et al. at col. 4, line 22 through col. 5, line 45 is a cite to most of the Summary of the Invention section of Delany et al. Delany et al. is to an electronic mail system providing improved methodology for processing messages sent to mailing lists. Delany et al., Abstract. Delany et al. discusses that upon receiving a message from a mail user agent or another message transfer agent a program stores the message temporarily locally and analyses the recipients and either delivers it or forwards it to another mail transfer agent. Delany et al., col. 4, lines 22-24. Upon receiving an e-mail message sent to a predefined mailing list, the system's mail transfer agent hands off the message with the name of the list to the system's mailing list manager. Delany et al., col. 4, lines 32-35. In Delany et al. a mailing list can be used in the recipient filed for an e-mail message, in lieu of listing individual members, so that a message sent to this distribution list goes to all recipients listed. Delany et al., col. 4, lines 41-44. Delany et al. continues with details of operation of such a system. Delany et al. does not appear to disclose or

Appln No. 09/886,538
Amdt date January 25, 2007
Reply to Office action of July 25, 2006

suggest "providing contact information regarding a user...automatically in response to receiving updated contact information of the user" as specified by claim 3.

Accordingly, claim 3 is allowable, as are dependent claims 4-10 and 12-14.


Claim 15 is amended for form and to specify that contact information of a specific user is provided automatically when the contact information for the specific user changes. Thus, claim 15 is in some ways similar to now-cancelled prior claims 11 and 17. In view of the discussion above, Celik and Delany et al. do not disclose providing contact information of a specific user automatically when a contact information for the specific user changes.

Accordingly, claim 15 and dependent claim 16 are allowable.

Accordingly, the now pending claims are in condition for allowance, and allowance of same is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By 
Daniel M. Cavanagh, Reg. No. 41,661
Telephone: 626/795-9900

FS/cah

RMW IRV1103426.1-*01/25/07 3:41 PM